

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed October 24, 2006, claims 1 and 4-6 were rejected. Applicants have thoroughly reviewed the outstanding Office Action including the Examiner's remarks and the references cited therein. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action. All the pending claims at issue are believed to be patentable over the cited references.

No claims have been added. Claims 2-3 and 7 having previously been cancelled, claims 1 and 4-6 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 4-6 have been amended as shown above. Support for the subject matter added to claims 1 and 4-6 may be found throughout the specification and figures of the present application, for example, in FIGS. 1-4 thereof. As such, no new matter has been added.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claims 1, 4, and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. The above claim amendments directly address all of the comments included in the Office Action and therefore render this rejection moot.

At least in view of the above claim amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 4, and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – DEFECTIVE REISSUE DECLARATION

Claims 1 and 4-6 were rejected as being based upon a defective reissue declaration under 35 U.S.C. §251. The Supplemental Declaration for Reissue Patent Application submitted herewith directly addresses the Examiner's comments and renders this rejection moot.

At least in view of the Supplemental Declaration for Reissue Patent Application submitted herewith and above remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. §251 is respectfully requested.

SUBMISSION OF THE ORIGINAL RIBBONED COPY OF THE PATENT

Applicants thank the Examiner for the reminder that the original ribboned copy of the patent must be surrendered before this application can be allowed. However, Applicants point out that a Statement as to Loss of Original Patent dated February 14, 2005, has previously been submitted to the U.S. Patent Office. A courtesy copy of the Statement is attached hereto for the Examiner's convenience.

CONCLUSION

At least in view of the foregoing claim amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request all the rejections to the specification and claims be removed. If, for any reason, the Examiner disagrees, please call the undersigned attorney at 202-861-1716 in an effort to resolve any matter still outstanding before issuing another action. The undersigned attorney is confident that any issue which might remain can readily be worked out by telephone.

Docket No. 87344.1524
Serial No.: 10/621,317
Customer No. 30734

Patent

In the event this paper is not timely filed, Applicants petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fee deficiencies or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2036 with reference to Attorney Docket No. 87344.1524.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP


Hermes M. Soyez
Reg. No. 45,852

Date: Jan. 24, 2007
Washington Square, Suite 1100
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-5304
Telephone: 202-861-1500
Facsimile: 202-861-1783